DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 073 EA 016 595

AUTHOR Bouchard, Yvon
TITLE Cross-Cultural Comparative Studies of Effective Schools: A Review and Replication.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Context; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnocentrism; Literature Reviews; Outcomes of Education; *Research Design; *School Effectiveness; *School Role; School Surveys; Student Development
IDENTIFIERS Coleman Report; International Assn Evaluation Educ Achievement; Rutter (Michael)

ABSTRACT

Research findings from various countries on the role of schools in student development are reviewed, with an eye toward promoting a comparative model for research on the subject. First, research is discussed that indicates that schools have little or no effect relative to students' home background and individual qualities (the 1966 Coleman report and its sequels, and the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement studies during 1973-76). These studies' findings are ambiguous, the author concludes, because the researchers did not allow for different educational objectives under different social systems. More system-specific studies, which indicate that schools do have a significant effect, are then discussed--particularly one in inner city London (Michael Rutter and others) and several in developing countries. Finally, the author presents his own comparative analysis of 61 Quebec schools. Because "academic climate"--especially students' "sense of academic futility"--is the most important predictor of academic achievement, he concludes that the outcome of education depends largely on its objectives. (MCG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242073

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Yvon Bouchard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS: A REVIEW AND REPLICATION

PAPER PRESENTED AS A PART OF THE SYMPOSIUM

RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS:

STATE OF THE ART

American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting

April 11-15, 1983, Montreal, Canada

Yvon Bouchard
Professor of sociology
and Education
Université du Québec à Rimouski
Rimouski, Québec, G5L 3A1

(Not to be reproduced or quoted without consent of the author)

EA 016 595

1. GENERAL STATEMENT

The main purpose of this presentation is to review some of the literature on school effect which involves data gathered outside of the United States and literature which proposes some comparative material including North America. This review will stress the main works and their general results only for clarity purpose. It should be evident that I will not intend to specific details unless they appear important to address the issue of effectiveness.

My intent is to present results from countries which experience a similar system as America and to draw from those countries which experience low levels of economic development. I shall then stress on the necessity of using a comparative approach to face this debate and present data from Quebec which should help to clarify this issue.

Also, this presentation will avoid most of the methodological issues involved with this kind of research. This might look surprising due to the fact that cross-cultural research faces a double problem here; in fact, while it is quite unclear within our countries what is effectiveness and how it should be measured, the question of effectiveness and of the desired output of schooling are quite different from one country to another. Obviously and instead of trying to attack the value of the researches on those grounds, I will try to use their results to generate a new perspective on school effect research that will bear on differences rather than on similarities. As long as we look for similarities between schools or among school systems from similar countries, it should appear obvious that we try to tap those variables which are most susceptible to be comparable and then to be working in the same direction. For example, when we are focusing on school output as academic achievement only, we must limit our comparison to those societies which value this result in order to be able to assess the same kind of data. On the other hand, when we look at the differences between

schools from the point of view of their very differences, then the variables which account for the output will appear in a new perspective.

This issue is important because the most proeminent recent analysis on this subject of cross-cultural research on school effect conclude, as within our own countries, to the ambiguousness of the results because researchers come to quite opposite data. I will try to demonstrate why these results appear ambiguous on the ground that these researches are not equivalent and that these very differences are what should be looked for in order to advance on this issue.

2. NO SCHOOL EFFECT RESEARCHES

The researches which are interesting to review from other countries as well as those using several different social systems at the same time have in common that they state the problem in the same lines as it is advanced in the United States. What is relevant literature for this purpose is the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey (Coleman 1966), the research on inequality by C. Jencks (1972), the heridity debate generated by Jensen (1969) and the Bowles and Gintis (1976) hypothesis that the economic system and that the social structure of society are the most important determinants of school outcome. The main conclusions which are retained are the followings: home background as expressed by father occupation and schooling and individual qualities pertaining to intelligence are by far the most important variables which account for the variance in individual school success.

The Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey (EEOS) was retained as a model for two other important surveys which addressed a similar original problem as Coleman faced which is whether the nation schools are conducive to equality: the Plowden Report in the United Kingdom (Children and their Primary Schools 1967) and the Karmel Report in Australia (Cuttance 1980). These major investigations of school related characteristics relevant to student performance do repeat the Coleman Report findings that social selection prior to schooling has an important influence on pupil outcome. School related variables may have some effect but at the individual level, none of them come close to home background characteristics for the variance explained. Given the general knowledge of the Equality of Educational Opportunity Research, I shall not stress these reports here.

A group of researchers in the London area (Brimer, Madaus et al. 1978) however addressed some of the EEOS conclusions to see whether contributions of school (curriculum, ressources, organization and teaching) are greater in England than in the United States. They used a sample of students, rather homogeneous in levels of educational survival and achievement, because in the EEOS, the large variations on these points lead to individual differences according to them. They tried to separate the influences coming from family, individuals, schools and teachers and they used a measure of processes, attitudes and values of agents. The schools at the secondary level were chosen for variations in previous and overall academic orientations of students and then, the between school variance in achievement is greater than the within as far as achievement is concerned in the sampling. They entered the variables in five (5) blocks in the regressions analysis (School-Teacher-Family-Individual-School/individual).

As a general conclusion, the total variance explained is over 50% in half of the schools and more of the between is explained than of the within. In fact, the individual block explained the differences within while teacher and school blocks explained the differences between. In

interpreting the results, one must be cautious because the sample was deliberately selected as homogeneous. Also, social class composition was included as a school variable while there was significant social class differences between schools. The authors conclude then that parents send their child in the school they want, which is common in England, and then we obtain a collusive effect in the sense that better students, who come from better families,go to better schools and so on. Their findings differ from the EEOS because the differences are not due to school factors nor background but rather are a consequence of progressive differenciation. Schools manage to do the best out of the students they get in the adaptative sense and schools maximize differences between students. According to these results, school makes a difference in concert with the other social agencies but school cannot counter the trends of society.

The second most important line of research regarding school effect comes from the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement which is known on the IEA studies. This work, contained in a nine-volume set of books published between 1973 and 1976 is regarded as the most extensive and complex piece of educational research undertaken until now (Farrell 1979). This research involved several scholars for a decade in an in-depth study of levels of academic achievement in six subjects areas (sciences, reading comprehension, literature, English as a foreign language, French as a foreign language and civic education). The researchers looked at the factors that affect those levels of achievement in twenty-one countries. They addressed student populations ranging from ten years of age to those in the last year of secondary schooling. There purpose was to develop internationally valid evaluation instruments and to design a survey of educational facilities and practices as they existed in this "laboratory" model. The aim was also to identify the factors accounting for differences between countries, schools and students. The data included 500 independant variables and a lot of them are capable of manipulation by policy (Heyneman and Loxley 1982).

The general conclusions of the IEA studies are quite similar to those of the single nation reports mentioned before which is that academic performance is generally higher when children come from privileged economic backgrounds (Thorndike 1975) and this influence overpasses the sum total of influence resulting from the measured effects of school and teacher quality.

These first hand conclusions are quite interesting given the fact that so many social systems were involved and one should be tempted to confirm the ineffectiveness of schools in comparison with home background as far as achievement is concerned. However, the observation which several reviewers of the IEA studies consider as one of the most interesting finding is the difference observed between the majority of the countries which are considered as "developped" and the four developping nations of the study namely (Chile, Thailand, Iran and India) (Farrell 1979, Saha 1983, Theiser et al. 1983). Put briefly, the proportion of the variance in achievement accounted for by in-school variables compared to the proportion accounted for by home background variables is much greater in the developping nations than in the developped nations. In one reanalysis of IEA data, for example, Heyneman (1976) showed that the association between "pre-school influence" and academic achievement diminished in linear fashion with the national per capita income of countries in the IEA sample - the poorer the country, the weaker the association.

On the other hand, Coleman (1975) questioned some methodological issues of the IEA studies. Using different measures with their data, he came to different results, even if he showed that an exact comparison cannot be made between countries. His main conclusion is that reading achievement is more fully an outgrowth of home influence than science and literature. Influence then is subject specific. Husén (1979) noted also that reading is related to home background totally while foreign language is directly related to school. Finally, Postlethwaite (1975) advances that

there are quite large differences between countries in the relationship between attainment on the one hand and home and school variables on the other. For example, when home background is aggregated at the school level, which gives us a neighborhood effect, the amount of variance accounted for between school in science is extremely high in Scotland while it is absent in Sweden. However, school factors do contribute largely in Sweden but not in Scotland.

These are only a few of the detailed re-analysis of the data obtained from the IEA studies. They are sufficient however to warn us from adopting conclusions which are not system specific. In the attempt to generalize to large aggregates, the researchers cannot avoid ambiguity linked with variables proper to the society or the sub-culture involved when they are not taken into account. Also, for comparison purpose, it is important for researchers trying to generalize to look at variables present in each of the systems and then they compare similar things within difference societies. There is no doubt then that the results are similar to those found in the society where the model came from because those variables susceptible of differenciation are omitted. This issue of differenciation appears clearly when we analyze the researches which conclude to school effect in the sense that the researches are all system specific.

3. SCHOOL EFFECT RESEARCHES

I shall now review some of the conclusions obtained from some such recent studies conducted in various nations.

One of the most remarkable piece of research to have camen out in the recent years on that subject outside North America is certainly the work of Michael Rutter and his colleagues titled: Fifteen Thousand Hours:

Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children (1979). The title refers to the number of hours spent by children in school during the 12 years when schools and teachers may have an impact on their development. They addressed the following questions: Do a child experiences at school have any effect, does it matter what school he goes to and which are the features of the school that matter? They started from the point that building and ressources are not important, the crucial differences between schools concerning aspects of school life having to do with its functionning as a social organization. They considered climate and atmosphere as important but tried to focus on staff action or activities which lay behind the intangible but important features. They assessed the changes due to school in children's behaviors and in the delinquency rates observed in the schools. They chose twelve secondary schools from the inner city of London. The schools were quite similar in the sense that the majority of the children came from ordinary homes even if many of them came from homes which were in one way or another disadvantaged. There were little differences between schools as far as curriculum is concerned, teacher body composition, academic orientation of the students, quality of the building. Children were below national average at tests for non verbal intelligence and reading and schools contained few children with superior scores on these tests. Schools also had a high rate of emotional and behavioral difficulties at the beginning of the study.

Schools differed however in size, space available, sites, newness of the building and maintenance, style of leadership, some depended on local authority and other were operated by churches. Schools differed also in educational aims according to child development versus academic success, according to strict moral code versus liberty. The schools were chosen mainly for these differences.

They looked at four (4) types of measures: 1) measures of individual pupils at time of entering High School which they called intake (social background, cognitive ability and behavior); 2) process of schooling (social organization of the school and type of environment for learning which was provided); 3) outcome of schooling (attainments - behavior, attendance, examination success, employment, delinquency - as influenced by teacher, policies and the pupils themselves); 4) ecological influences (influences of the community).

They spent two years doing participant observation and getting involved in informal discussions with the staff. They looked mainly at school processes, specific events and behaviors through interviews, pupil's questionnaires, day-to-day observation of the classroom interactions and approaches to teaching using a wide range of structured and unstructured observations.

The authors showed that schools in innercity London differ markedly in the behavior and attainment shown by the pupils when we control for intake and these results are stable over a period of at least four to five years. Also, the schools performed fairly similarly on all the various measures of outcomes. There was no influence of size, age of building, space available nor administrative status of the school as organization. The differences between school outcomes were systematically related to these characteristics of social institutions which is the degree of academic emphasis, teacher action in lessons, the availability of incentives and rewards and so on. All these factors were open to modification by staff rather than by external constraints. The combined measures of outcomes was much stronger than any of the associations with individual process variables which suggest to the authors that they combine to create a particular "ethos" or set of values, attitudes and behaviors which will become a characteristic of the school as a whole. They concluded finally that there is a strong probability that the association between school

processes and outcomes reflect in part a causal process, i.e. child behavior and attitudes are shaped and influenced by their experiences at school and in particular by the qualities of the school as a social institution.

Their use of longitudinal data and measure of intakes provide strong evidence of the strength of their results. It does not suggest though that school can compensate for inequities in society but that schools constitute one major area of influence and one which is susceptible to change.

This last point of the conclusion provided ground for researchers questionning the influence of the school. If schools differ in levels of achievement given the composition of the student body as demonstrated by Rutter, then it is hard to separate the effect of the intakes from the effect of the school and conclude to the importance of one over the other. It has been argued that Rutter did not control enough for family background and then that he could not claim that schools matter (Cuttance 1980, Health and Clifford 1980, 1981, King 1979).

This issue of the powerlessness of schools to counteract the effects of society as a whole has also been revealed by Kevin Marjoribanks (1982) in an Australian sample of elementary schools. This study provides evidence regarding the association between levels of parental interests and schools attended by children. For this author, if systematic control for differences between kinds of parents is not done, then "school effect" may have been exaggerated.

These studies which addressed the Rutter's conclusions all demonstrated that family background is important but failed to demonstrate that school effect is absent. The hypothesis tested is not the same. As mentioned by Peter Cuttance (1980), the significant influence that schools do account for has not been adequately described by the findings of past researches. There is no ground for saying that schools do not make differences. It is our job to try to explain them.

Besides Rutter, I shall point to some other studies in the western world which faced this issue and tried to provide us with explanations.

The case of Israel is interesting for testing this hypothesis of school effect. During the two decades following World War II, Israel experienced massive immigration coming from Near and Middle East which now forms 50% of the population of this country while in 1948, 90% of the population was of European origin. Compensatory educational programs implemented during 10 to 15 years remained ineffective for these immigrants because the European culture was more important. A school Reform was enacted in 1968 to provide ethnically integrated education. Klein and Eshel (1980) from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem studied these integrated learning environments and in particular the impact of a teaching method appropriate to it which they developped and which they called "activity classroom". The results are as follow: integration alone was not related to improved school achievement of low class children (immigrants) either when measured longitudinally or cross-sectionnally. In contrast, integration in conjunction with the application of the activity classroom technique produced dramatic results, especially in mathematics. They concluded then to the effect of school because it is the combination of integration with application of appropriate educational technologies that yields beneficial results as demonstrated in several other studies of school effect (Brookover et al. 1977a, 1977b).

In Israel also, drawing on Turner's notion of sponsored versus contest mobility, Yuchtman and Samuel (1975) found that the effect of interpersonal variables on student aspirations varies considerably with the institutional school context, the influence of significant others being smaller within a rigid sponsored-mobility context, where the credentialing process tends to be the more important determing factor.

In Belgium, Herman Brutsaert (1982) examined also the effect of institutional properties of educational systems at the secondary school level. He assessed the influence of the institutional context of schools in two distinctive types of High Schools in Belgium, innovative versus traditional. Evidence provided by this study points to some salient differences in the subjective schooling outcomes and their determinants across school systems. He showed that curriculum enrollment - as a component of organizational differenciation within high schools - is determined by the type of school program. Especially noteworthy for him is the fact that low SES and female in innovative schools in this country have better chances of being placed in an academic curriculum then their counter-parts in traditional schools. In addition, academic aptitudes was found to be a stronger determinant of curriculum placement is innovative than is conventional schools. There is enough evidence for him to conclude that innovative schools in his country engender more equality of educational opportunity. The impact of social psychological variable was also found to be especially pronounced for innovative school students.

Despite their interest for us however, the analysis and studies conducted in Developped Countries provide results which are still qualified as ambiguous by several reviewers. It is certainly a fact that they do not provide as meaningful insights as those obtained in Less Developped Countries because it is there where the most striking differences appear. The educational conditions of these countries are less similar than those of developped countries and the quality of the schools and outcomes come far behind. We should add to this the point that the society often pursue objectives quite different from those found in our western world. We shall be relating from that now.

Theisen and his colleagues (1983) analysed the results of four types of researches or explanatory variables of achievement in these countries: background characteristics, school ressources, school and classroom environment, general social and cultural context in which instruction takes place. On the average, they found that there is a lot of variance explained for the school factors but the differences are larger as mentioned before when we look at the general level of economic development of the society in which achievement is measured. Home tends to be more important in more industrialized countries and school ressources show much more influences in Less Developped Countries.

From another point of view, Lawrence Saha (1983) analyzed the result obtained by 38 authors in 21 LDC on background and teacher related variables (qualifications and behaviors). Overall, teacher variables exert a positive effect on student achievement and only in a small number of cases is it negative. The most important variables are the sex of the teacher depending on the matter and mostly important, the credentials of the teacher. Then, there may be systematic differences between teacher effects between each type of countries. The reason she advances are that achievement measures are based on topics learned at school only in those countries, the expectations of the parents differ from those of school and finally class formation being absent in Less Developped Countries, home background is less important. Also she suggests then that as the internal structures of the LDC more clearly approximate those found in the developped societies, the pattern of school outcomes may become more similar.

Husén et Saha (1978) from another analysis, report that teacher qualification, amount of education, experience and knowledge of the teachers are positively related to student achievement in LDC's. Attributed variables seem also higly important, especially positive expectations of students which can override negative student self-image.

From those studies in LDC's the authors conclude about the background and ressources variables that even if they are important, more important is how

the equipment and money are used. "Achievement may be the result of a diliberate cost-benefit analysis of the functional outcomes of the efforts that must be expanded by the students". (Theisen et al. 1983).

Also, the analysis from these countries for classroom and school environment show that when all the rest is controlled, there remains such variations which are statistically significant. Since normative expectations of behavior differ within one country, the response to environmental characteristics that impinge on behavior may also be expected to vary cross-culturally.

These studies from the Less Developped Countries show finally that comparing academic achievement of students confronted by a rigidly set curriculum with that of students in an educational system characterized by a high degree of flexibility for disciplinary specialization is at best misleading. The danger of misinterpretation is of qualitative, not of quantitative nature. As reported by Theisen et al (1983), countries like Tanzania and North Korea which put pressure on educating for equity and social transformation cannot be regarded as those countries which value academic achievement. On a comparative basis then, academic performance (as measured by conventional achievement measures) receives less social sanction in liberation social systems than in contest, sponsored and manpower-oriented systems. In these cases, academic performance is at the backstage. The environmental press is then oriented towards other goals than generally measured and when they are measured, they appear to be important predicters of school outcomes. As demonstrated by Heyneman and Loxley (1982) the regression processes used in the IEA Studies were across all societies, this tended to reduce the importance of school variables because we were looking for variables equally important across the average of many societies. The results are quite different when we use variables important in that country only.

4. THE ASSESMENT OF SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT IN COMPARATIVE TERMS: THE CASE OF 61 QUEBEC SCHOOLS.

The fact that the amount of variance explained by school in the poorer countries is greater when we focus on significant variables brings to light the necessity of an approach which is at a significant level of analysis. There is a need for well articulated, stratified sampling procedures that call attention to rather than suppres regional and contextual variations in the educational process (Theisen et al. 1983). The IEA re-analysis showed the advantage of using a comparative approach (Farrel 1979), the necessity to select samples which are enough similar to compare (Brimer et al. 1978), and to place the focus on differential treatments allocated to individuals, on the basis of their social and educational characteristics (Cuttance 1980). Finally, researches called attention to the necessity of selecting large samples of schools to be able to compare (Gray 1981).

These conclusions show the advantages of opting for a research strategy which is based on differences rather than on similarities. This is true as well for school variables as for outcomes. For example, in a research conducted in Ireland, George Madaus et al. (1979) found that curriculum based tests are more sensitive to differences in school characteristics than are standardized tests. When you look at what is important for a school system, you touch the variables school has an effect on. The problem with research on school effect may be that we look at similar schools or similar variables within similar school systems and then we consider that the school environment does not account for differences in student outcomes on those ground. This calls for the necessity to expand the scope of variations between the schools under study. Although it is difficult to get involved in a cross-cultural research of the nature of the IEA studies, one can use the strategies proposed by comparative research to look at the schools within one country and consider them as different social systems with characteristics similar enough to be comparable and different enough to engender meaningful insights. This calls for a strategy that purposively selects samples that maximize the range of variations on educational prac-

tices and environments and that develops sensitive measures that capture variations in educational environments existing in representative samples of schools and classrooms (McPartland and Karweit 1979).

This is the strategy I implemented in search conducted here in the Province of Quebec. My purpose was to a s the impact of three different sets of variables thought to play an important role over school academic achievement by previous researchers, mainly contextual, organizational and climate variables. The originality of this research stems from the fact that the school was considered as the unit of analysis and that variables were constructed on that regard.

In this research, I looked at the structural constraints within the social organization of schooling which condition educational outcomes independently of individual or antecedent variables acting by themselves. It has been assumed in past research on school effect indeed that there is a linear relationship among the variables producing achievement and this is still to be tested (Sorensen and Hallinan 1977). I was looking after the mechanisms that produce learning as a function of the various relevant characteristics of students and their environment, including the teaching the students are exposed to in schools, the organization through which they are processed and the sub-culture specific to that environment which is different from outside press. The focus was then placed on the learning which takes place as a result of student's exposure to school activities and structuring. I thought it would be more meaningful to compare between schools over variability in achievement than to try to partial out individual and school influence to measure school effect, provided the pertinent variables of influences are controlled in the model. The results might not tell much about the causal sequence of social variables but informs us about the different impacts of various school arrangements.

This research could be considered as a replication of Wilbur Brookover studies in Michigan (1977a, 1977b) because the model developped

postulated that school climate - which is a variable proper to the school as a unit - is the mediating factor through which contextual (including background) and structural (administrative apparatus) variables exert their influence over achievement and that its impact overpasses that of the other variables. Second, the measures developped to assess the academic climate are an adaptation for Quebec of the scales written by Brookover. This research differs however from its counterpart in Michigan on the ground that there was no intent to find a representative sample. Instead, schools were chosen on the ground of their differences on the major variables for the reasons mentioned before. The schools were selected to obtain variations in size, level of urbanization of the community, socio-economic level of the populations surrounding the school, teachers qualifications, innovativeness of the school and type of leadership exerted by the principal. A total of 61 elementary schools were selected to obtain variations on these different aspects in the sample itself. Each school was visited by an assistant and the data were obtained from interviews with the principal, questionnaires administered to the teachers and fifth grades. File data was used whenever available. Academic achievement was based on the standardized tests in mathematics, reading and writing developped and administered by the Department of Education of the province. All the schools in the sample had had experience in these tests for the previous years. The dependant variable used was school mean academic achievement on the tests.

In order to render the sample similar enough for comparison, the schools selected were limited to the north-north-east portion of the province including Quebec City where the vast majority of the population is french speaking. This was intended to avoid the problem involved with the objectives pursued by different ethnies and to simplify the regression analysis. We should remember the problem faced by school effect research in the US where race is sometimes hard to separate meaningfully from socio-economic level. The sample obtained in Quebec appears large enough to be significant, involves different school systems and provides similar enough environments to be able to compare schools as unit of analysis.

The results obtained are as follows: as expected, home background of the student body is highly correlated with academic climate (.50). This is especially true for the climate variables pertaining to children, teachers, and principal future expectations. The relationship of each of the two main variables with achievement is also equally important (.43 and .42) (Bouchard 1981).

Several regression analysis were done to separate the net effect of the two sets of variables. While 52% of the variance over achievement is explained by the two variables, when home background of the student body is intered first in the regression analysis, 19% of the variance is accounted for. If we enter the climate variables first, 51% of the variance is explained. This is extremely high compared with home background although there remains a lot of the variance not accounted for. The climate variables which do systematically account for variation in achievement in either high or low socio-economic background schools are children sense of academic futility and teachers' variables regarding actual evaluation fo the school.

In order to obtain a specific view of the different school variables related to achievement, several regressions were done with the variables individually and in blocks. The results are rather impressive. First, climate variables are by far the best predictor of academic success in the schools selected, students sense of academic futility or feeling of fatalism before school is in all regards the single most important variable whether or not we control for size of the school, home background and so on. Second, the location of the school, its size, the level and type of parental investment in the school, teacher-pupil ratio, specialization, strandardization and formalization of procedures, decentralization in the decision-making process, technology used in the school all have but very little to do with academic achievement. Third, school organization in terms of administrative procedures and technology is more a matter of response to the environment than to the outcomes previledged. Large schools are found in big cities, are well equipped in specialists and have

a small teacher-pupil ratio. Schools which consider themselves as innovative have open classes, integrate special children, experience a large level of participation in the decision-making, have a low level of formalization and son on. Fourth, parents participation in the schools sampled is more a matter of choice than a matter of academic necessity. Fifth, socio-economic composition of the student body is a variable which is linked with several other variables. For example, previledged schools are found in large cities, have more specialists, are better equiped schools, get involved in more open technologies and types of participation.

The results show that school facilities, technology and organization, although they are qualities with can be modified by policy may not have an important impact in themselves over mean academic achievement of the school. If we acknowledge that school academic climate is more significant that either these or socio-economic composition of the student body, we must then consider the possibility that the effect of the school is not only a matter of school characteristic proper to this environment but mostly a matter of interpretation of this environment by people living in it. In the social system of the school, when the normative system, expectations and values shared by the participants are oriented towards an academic goal, the results show that this arrangement is more conducive to academic learning then any other single factor or group of factors arrangement. This conclusion concurs with Brookover's climate findings in Michigan, Rutter's "ethos" in England and findings from developping nations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bouchard, Yvon
1981 "Perceptions scolaires, relations parents-écoles et apprentissage." Les Sciences de l'Éducation 2-3 : 177-226.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis
1976 Schooling in Capitalist America : Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York : Basic Books.

Brimer, A., George F. Madaus, B. Chapman, Thomas Kellaghan and R. Wood
1978 Sources of Differences in School Achievement. Slough, England : NFER Publishing Co.

Brookover, Wilbur B. and Lawrence W. Lezotte
1977a "Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement." East Lansing : College of Urban Development, Michigan State University.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer and Joe Wisenbaker
1977b "Schools can make a difference." East Lansing : College of Urban Development, Michigan State University.

Brutsaert, Herman
1982 "Type of high school system and subjective school outcomes." International Journal of Comparative Sociology 23 : 88-98.

Children and their Primary Schools : A Report of the Central Advisory
1967 Council for England (Plowder Report) II : Research and Surveys. London : Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Coleman, James S.
1975 "Methods and results in the IEA studies of effects of schools on learning." Review of Educational Research 45 : 355-386.

Coleman, James S., Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol, J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederick D. Weinfall, and Robert L. York
1966 The Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Cuttance, Peter
1980 "Do schools consistently influence the performance of their students?" Educational Review 32 : 267-280.

Farrell, Joseph P.
1979 "The IEA studies : factors that affect achievement in six subjects in Twenty-One countries." Teachers College Record 79 : 289-297.

Heath, A. and P. Clifford
1980 "The seventy thousand hours that Ritter left out." Oxford Review of Education 6 : 3-19.
1981 "The measurement and explanation of school differences." Oxford Review of Education 7 : 33-40.

Heyneman, Stephen P.
1976 "Influences on academic achievement : a comparison of results from Uganda and more industrialized societies." Sociology of Education 49 : 200-211.

Heyneman, Stephen P. and William A. Loxley
1982 "Influences on academic achievement across high and low income countries : a re-analysis of IEA Data." Sociology of Education 55 : 13-21

Husén, Torsten
1979 The School in Question : A Comparative Study of the School and its Future in Western Society. London : Oxford University Press.

Husén, Torsten, Lawrence J. Saha, and Richard Noonan
1978 Teacher Training and Student Achievement in LDC's. Washington DC : World Bank.

Jencks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary J. Bane, David Cohen, Herbert Gintis, Barbara Heyns, and Stephan Michelson
1972 Inequality : A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York : Basic Books.

Jensen, Arthur R.
1969 "How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement?" Harvard Educational Review 39 : 1-123.

King, Susan
1979 "Review of fifteen thousand hours." Educational Research and Perspectives 6 : 82-84.

Klein, Zeen and Yohanen Eshel
1980 Integrating Jerusalem Schools. New York : Academic Press.

Madaus, George F., Thomas Kellaghan, Ernest A. Rakow and Denis J. King
1979 "The sensivity of measures of school effectiveness." Harvard Educational Review 49 : 207-

Marjoribanks, Kevin
1982 "Fifteen thousand hours : a related study of family school differences." Educational Studies 8 :

McPartland, James, and Nancy Karweit
1979 "Research on educational effects." Pp. 371-385 Herbert J. Walberg, (ed.), Educational Environments and Effects : Evaluation, Policy and Productivity. Berkeley : McCutchan.

Postlethwaite, T.N.
1975 "The surveys of the international association for the evaluation of educational achievement (IEA)." Alan C. Purves and Daniel V. Levine, (eds.), Educational Policy and International Assessment : Implications of the IEA Surveys of Educational Achievement. Berkeley : McCutchan.

Rutter, Michael, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimer, Janet Ouston, and Alan Smith
1979 Fifteen Thousand Hours : Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children. Cambridge : Harvard University Press.

Saha, Lawrence J.
1983 "Social structure and teacher effects on academic achievement : a comparative analysis." Comparative Educational Review 27 : 69-88.

Sorensen, A.B. and Marreen T. Hallinan
1977 "A reconceptualization of school effects." Sociology of Education 50 : 273-289.

Theisen, Gary L., Paul W. Achola, and Francis M. Boakari
1983 "The underachievement of cross-national studies of achievement." Comparative Educational Review 27 : -87.

Thorndike, Robert L.
1975 "The relation of school achievement to differences in the backgrounds of children." Pp 93-104 Alan C. Purves and Daniel V. Levine, (eds.), Educational Policy and International Assessment : Implications of the IEA Surveys of Educational Achievement. Berkeley : McCutchan.

Yuchtman, Y.E. and E. Samuel
1975 "Determinants of career plans : institutional versus interpersonal effects." American Sociological Review 40 : 521-31.